**ASCC SBS Panel**

Approved Minutes

Monday, April 17, 2017 9:45 -11:15 AM

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Givens, Kaylor, Kline, Lam, Oldroyd, Roup, Valle, Vankeerbergen

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 4-3-17 minutes

* Roup, Givens, unanimously approved

1. Communication 2540 (existing course; request to offer 100% DL)

* **Course goals need to be consistent in both the in-class and online syllabi as well as the form on curriculum.osu.edu.**
* **Correct the course schedule, which should have 12 weeks of classes beginning on May 10th.**
* **Explain how C-REP extra credit points will be allocated.**
* *The panel recommends changing the name of the Rapid Reports to Weekly Response or Weekly Report, since students are given one week to complete the assignment.*
* Roup, Givens, unanimously approved with **three contingencies (in bold above)** and *one recommendation (in italics above)*

1. Communication 3331 (existing course; request to offer 100% DL)

* **Course goals need to be consistent in both the in-class and online syllabi as well as the form on curriculum.osu.edu.**
* **Correct the course schedule, which should have 12 weeks of classes beginning on May 10th.**
* **Adjust the points in the grade breakdown. Writing Assignments and the Choice Analysis are both worth 125 points, but listed as 30% and 25% of the grade, respectively. Discussion participation is worth 150 points and 30% of the total grade.**
* **Explain how the discussion participation grade will be evaluated.**
* **The student participation requirements section page 6 seems to be boilerplate language on participation. Do these requirements serve any function in this course? Are there any consequences if these requirements are not met (e.g. not logging in at least three times per week)?**
* *The Student Academic Services statement on page 7 is repeated under Student Services. The Student Services statement should say, “The Student Service Center assists with financial aid matters, tuition and fee payments. Please see their site at:* [*http://ssc.osu.edu*](http://ssc.osu.edu)*”*
* Roup, Givens, unanimously approved with **five contingencies (in bold above)** and *one recommendation (in italics above)*

1. Communication 3554 (existing course; request to offer 100% DL)

* **Course goals need to be consistent in both the in-class and online syllabi as well as the form on curriculum.osu.edu.**
* **Correct the grade breakdown the syllabus. Points add up to 450 points, not 500 and percentage points only add up to 90%.**
* *The panel recommends removing the word “requirement” from the Student participation requirements section heading on page 6 since these participation expectations do not seem to have an effect on the grade.*
* Givens, Roup, unanimously approved with **two contingencies (in bold above)** and *one recommendation (in italics above)*

1. Communication 2331 (existing course w/ GE Social Science—Individuals and Groups; request to offer 100% DL)

* **Course goals need to be consistent in both the in-class and online syllabi as well as the form on curriculum.osu.edu.**
* *There are a number of errors in the course learning outcomes section on page 2 of the syllabus.* 
  + *Move the first sentence “By the end of this course, students should successfully be able to:” to the end of the first paragraph so the learning outcomes are listed directly after this statement. Remove the word “students” from the numbered list of learning outcomes that will follow this statement.*
  + *The first paragraph refers to Communication 3325 instead of Communication 2331.*
  + *Remove the reference to GEC in the first paragraph. Under semesters, we only use GE language, not GEC.*
* *What is each quiz worth if the lowest grade is dropped?*
* *The panel recommends removing the word “requirement” from the Student participation requirements section heading on page 7 since these participation expectations do not seem to have an effect on the grade.*
* **Clarify the discrepancy in points between the grade breakdown and the assessment plan. The SWOT analysis is worth 100 points in the syllabus, 75 points on the sample assignment, and 150 points in the assessment plan. The Target Audience Analysis is worth 125 points in the syllabus and 150 points in the assessment plan. Or could it be that the points in the assessment plan do not refer to course grades but to a rubric?**
* **The assessment plan appears to be based on grades (or is it? See bullet point above), which is not the best measure of GE ELO achievement as factors other than GE ELO fulfillment influence assignment grades. The assessment plan also mentions achieving Milestone 2, which may be a reference to a GE rubric, but no rubric is provided. Please provide a rubric.**
* **If the final project evaluates all three ELOs, then the table should mention this project for ELO 1.**
* Roup, Givens, unanimously approved with **four contingencies (in bold above)** and *three recommendations (in italics above)*